

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/777,122	02/05/2001	Heinz Greiner	188.463	2422
20311	7590 02/10/2	003		
MUSERLIAN AND LUCAS AND MERCANTI, LLP			EXAMINER	
600 THIRD A NEW YORK			NGUYEN, XUAN LAN T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3683	
			DATE MAILED: 02/10/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
. Advisory Action	09/777,122	GREINER, HEINZ
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Lan Nguyen	3683
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 22 January 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period cee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s): <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se	reconsideration has been consi e Continuation Sheet.	dered but does NOT place the
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to: 3 and 7.		٨
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 2, 4, 5 and 6</u> .		(\
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		. \\
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examiner.∬
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	
 0.□ Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	White Chillips Examine



Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 112, first and second paragraphs rejections of claim 3. The rejections as stated in paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the final rejection dated 10/23/02 are hereby withdrawn. Also, the objection to the specification in paragraph 1 of the final rejection dated 10/23/02 is also withdrawn.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner maintains that Tonogai discloses the structure of the linear rolling bearing as claimed in claim 1. The determination of patentability in a product-by-process claim is based on the product itselt, even though the claim may be limited and defined by the process.